

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the above-noted Office Action, and herein amends the present Application. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Applicant has Amended Claim 1 to remove the portion previously set forth in lines 18-19 above, for which the Examiner was objecting to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Claim 1, as amended herein, no longer sets forth that the end portion of the filtration unit may be secured to one of said upper housing and said lower housing. Applicant requests withdrawal to the Examiner's objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a).

The disclosure was objected in paragraph 12, lines 18 and 24, and in paragraph 15, line 2. Applicant has herein amended paragraphs 12 and 15 of the Specification to overcome the objection thereto. Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure.

Claim 18 was objected to in the Office Action for referring to the term "source" rather than "source." Applicant has amended Claim 18, in line 2 above, to correctly refer to the term "source." Applicant respectfully submits that such amendment was made to overcome the objection to Claim 18, and not for reasons of distinguishing Claim 18 over the prior art of record. Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection to Claim 18.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. As noted above, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to removed the portion of Claim 1 set forth in lines 18-19 above, which prior to entry of this Amendment set forth that the lower end portion of the filtration unit may be "secured to one of said upper housing and said lower housing." Claim 1 no longer sets forth that the filtration unit may be secured to the lower housing. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

In the Office Action, Claims 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for the term “said light source” not having proper antecedent basis. Applicant has amended Claim 8 to depend from Claim 1, which as amended incorporates the previous limitations of Claim 6. Applicant also amended Claim 16 to depend from Claim 14. Applicant respectfully submits that such amendments were made to the claims to overcome 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections and are not being made for reasons of distinguishing the respective claims over the prior art of record. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Applicant has also amended pending Claims 1 and 17 to correct typographical errors. Namely, Claim 1 was amended in line 16 to correctly refer to the “end portion,” providing proper antecedent basis for the term, Claim 17 was amended in line 42 to change the word “elements” to “element,” and Claim 17 was amended in line 56, the last line of the claim, to replace the ending semicolon with a period, to end the sentence setting forth Claim 17. Applicant respectfully submits that such amendments were not being made for reasons of distinguishing the respective claims over the prior art of record.

Claims 1-3 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Holz et al.* In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that Claim 6 contained allowable subject matter. (See the Office Action, on page 9, paragraph 4). Applicant herein amends Claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of Claim 6, such that Claim 1 should now be allowable over the prior art of record. Since Claims 2-3 incorporate the limitations of Claim 1, as amended, Claims 2 and 3 are also allowable over the prior art of record. Applicant further notes that Claim 3 was also amended to distinguish *Holz et al.*, setting forth that the at least one rib of Claim 3 extends radially outward of the housing, distinguishing the end shoulder of the upper housing of *Holz et al.* Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Regarding Claims 9-13, the Examiner indicated in the Office Action that Claim 17 contains allowable subject matter, in regard to the prior art failing to teach or suggest “at least one protuberance extending from the enclosed lower end.... within the top of the lower housing with an interference fit.” (See the Office Action, on page 10, paragraph 3). Applicant has herein

incorporated the limitation of the at least one protuberance into Claim 9 to distinguish the prior art of record, such that Claim 9 should now be allowable. Since Claims 10-11 incorporate the limitations of Claim 9, as amended, and Claim 9 is allowable for the reasons set forth above, Claims 10 and 11 are also allowable over the prior art of record. Applicant further notes that Claim 11 was also amended to distinguish *Holz et al.*, setting forth that the at least one rib of Claim 11 extends radially outward of the housing, distinguishing the end shoulder of the upper housing of *Holz et al.* Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Holz et al.* in view of *Overboe et al.*; and Claims 5 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Holtz et al.* in view of *Magnusson*. Applicant respectfully submits that since Claims 4 and 5 depend from and incorporate each of the limitations of Claim 1, as amended, and Claims 12 and 13 depend from and thus incorporate each of the limitations of Claim 9, as amended, and since for the reasons set forth above Claims 1 and 9 are allowable over the prior art of record, Claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 are also allowable over the prior art of record. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant thanks the Examiner for kindly noting that Claims 6-8, 14-16, and 18 contain allowable subject matter if amended to overcome the respective objections to and the respective rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. Applicant respectfully submits that such objections and rejections have been overcome, and requests allowance of Claims 6-8, 14-16 and 18.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place the application in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the Claims 1-5, and 7-22 as amended, and that the Application proceed to issuance.

The U.S. Patent & Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502112/JBST-27,606US for the firm CHAUZA & HANDLEY, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

CHAUZA & HANDLEY, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)



Mark W. Handley, Esq.
Registration No. 36,821

MWH/lv

CHAUZA & HANDLEY, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 140036
Irving, Texas 75014
Tel: (972) 518-1713
Fax: (972) 518-1777

November 21, 2006